

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,874	06/29/2001	Lawrence Y. Fang	13615.40USU1	1026
20306	7590 04/03/2003			
MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF 300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE SUITE 3200			EXAMINER .	
			KUMAR, SHAILENDRA	
CHICAGO, IL	60606		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1621	12
			DATE MAILED: 04/03/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/896,874

Applicant(s)

Fang et al

Examiner

Shailendra Kumar

Art Unit **1621**



		on the cover sheet with the correspondence address				
	for Reply					
THE N	A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the					
mailing	date of this communication.					
- If NO p - Failure - Any re	period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply a to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the platent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. he application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) 💢	Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 7, 20	003				
2a) □	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This act	ion is non-final.				
3) 💢	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex pair	except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is arte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.				
-	tion of Claims					
4) 💢	Claim(s) <u>2-13, 16-18, 21-24, and 27-148</u>	is/are pending in the application.				
4	a) Of the above, claim(s) 31-143	is/are withdrawn from consideration.				
	Claim(s) <u>2-13</u> , <u>16-18</u> , <u>21-24</u> , <u>27-30</u> , <u>and 144-148</u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
6)□	Claim(s)	is/are rejected.				
7) 🗆	Claim(s)	is/are objected to.				
8) 🗆	Claims	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.				
	ition Papers					
9) 🗆	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	a) \square accepted or b) \square objected to by the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the d					
11)		is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.				
_	If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply t	to this Office action.				
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exami	ner.				
	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
	13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
	☐ All b)☐ Some* c)☐ None of:					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
	2. \square Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority do application from the International Bures the attached detailed Office action for a list of the	au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of the					
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).						
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.						
i 5) ഥ Attachme		priority under 35 U.S.C. 33 120 and/or 121.				
_	tice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).				
_	tice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
3) X Info	3) X Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 9, 10 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 09/896,874 Page 2

Art Unit: 1621

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to applicants' communication filed in paper # 11, on

2/7/03.

Claims 2-13, 16-18, 21-24, and 27-148 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 14-15, 19-20

and 25-26 have been canceled. Claims 31-143 stand withdrawn from the consideration, being

drawn to the non elected invention.

1. Applicants' arguments with respect to the disclosure statement has been considered and

were not found convincing. The disclosure statement has not been considered for the reasons as

set forth in paper # 8. See the citation below.

The citations are Golden Valley Microwave Foods v. Weaver Popcorn Co., 24

USPQ 2d 1801, DC NInd 1992; Molins PLC v. Textron Inc., 33 USPQ 2d 1823

(CAFC 1995); and Penn Yan Boats v. Sea Lark Boats, 178 USPQ 577 (5th Cir.

1973).

The following is an electronic reproduction of the USPQ record of the Molins

CAFC decision:

Following this consultation, on September 21, 1984, Hirsh and Smith filed a document citing

a great deal of prior art under 37

Application/Control Number: 09/896,874 Page 3

Art Unit: 1621

Page 1831

C.F.R. Section 1.501 13 in the '563 patent file. The document was 11 pages in length and contained a listing of 23 U.S. patents, 27 foreign patents, and 44 U.S. and foreign printed publications. The citation was not accompanied by any comment or discussion concerning the relevancy of the patents and printed publications, nor were translations provided for most of the foreign patents and publications.

After the '563 patent was accepted for reexamination, Hirsh and Smith submitted a response to the first office action, requesting that the examiner consider and make of record all of the documents contained in the Rule 501 prior art citation. Hirsh and Smith provided English language equivalents or translations of the foreign documents and briefly commented as to the content of the cited art. They also cited the same prior art during prosecution of the '410 patent.

The court concluded that, by "burying" Wagenseil in a multitude of other references, Hirsh and Smith intentionally withheld it from the PTO because this manner of disclosure was tantamount to a failure to disclose. Citing Penn Yan Boats, Inc. v. Sea Lark Boats, Inc. , 359 F. Supp. 948, 175 USPQ 260 (S.D. Fla. 1972), aff'd , 479 F.2d 1328, 178 USPQ 577 (5th Cir.), cert. denied , 414 U.S. 874 (1973), the court stated that Hirsh's and Smith's failure to highlight Wagenseil in light of their knowledge of Whitson's actions in the foreign prosecutions violated their duty of candor to the PTO. Citing our precedent, Textron asserts that Smith's and Hirsh's conduct is "inexcusable, fraudulent, and cannot operate to cure Whitson's inequitable conduct." See Rohm & Haas Co. v. Crystal Chem. Co. , 722 F.2d 1556, 220 USPQ 289 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied , 469 U.S. 851 (1984) (where intentional material misrepresentations have been made, a "cure" through voluntary efforts during prosecution must be demonstrated by clear, unequivocal, and convincing evidence).

QUALE ACTION

This application is in condition for allowance except for the following formal matters:

Claims 31-143, drawn to the non elected invention, should be canceled. Claims 2-13, 16-18, 21-24, 27-30, and 144-148 are allowed..

Prosecution on the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire TWO MONTHS from the mailing date of this letter.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to S.Kumar whose telephone number is (703) 308-4519.

S.Kumar

April 2, 2003

PRIMARY EXAMINER

GROUP 1600